

## REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing amendments, and reexamination and reconsideration of the subject application, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. § 1.104 and § 1.112, and in light of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

### Amendments

Claim 19 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 22 and the parallel recitations in claims 29 and 32 regarding the composition and  $\mu$ " loss characteristics. The dependency of various dependent claims has been amended accordingly. No new matter is added.

### Claim Objection and Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112[2]

The phrase "magnetic thin films" has been amended to –magnetic thin film– in claim 19, and claim 31 is not dependent on claim 29, providing antecedent basis for the "magnetic loss material." Accordingly, the objection and rejection should now be withdrawn.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

The rejections of claims 19-26 and 28 as anticipated by Seo and Sato (*et al.*) are respectfully traversed.

As stated in the Office action, claims 29 and 32 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. By these amendments, the composition and  $\mu$ " loss characteristics recited in claims 29 and 32 have now been incorporated into claim 19. Seo does not appear to disclose the composition or  $\mu$ " loss characteristics now recited in claim 19. Further, both Seo and Sato are directed to magnetic recording media and not to a wiring board having a magnetic loss material. In the former, the intent is to allow electromagnetic energy to pass through to a layer in which the signal is stored/recorded, whereas in the latter the intent is to prevent the electromagnetic wave from passing through the material. In Sato, the loss materials disclosed at column seven are described as having suitable resistivities at up to "several tens MHz," not in the region of 100MHz to

10GHz as recited in claim 19. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

The rejection of claims 22-28 as obvious over Seo in view of Sato ('931) is respectfully traversed. As noted above, Seo is directed to magnetic recording media and not to boards having magnetic shielding. Sato is directed to various devices, and the example cited in the rejection (citing to the paragraph bridging columns 10 and 11 of Sato) is analogously directed to "a thin-film magnetic head for a hard disk drive" (col. 10, ln. 57-58). Further, the thin film disclosed in that portion of Sato is CoZrNb, which is not within the composition recited in claim 19.

The rejection of claim 27 as obvious over Sato ('313) in view of Sato ('913) is respectfully traversed. The mere existence of a thin film within the thickness recited in claim 27 does not render that claim obvious in light of the different uses and compositions for the film.

The rejection of claim 31 as obvious over the combination of Seo, Sato ('313), and Watanabe (*et al.*) is respectfully traversed. As noted, the first two references are directed to recording head, and Watanabe, similarly directed, describes a magnetic material to "decrease eddy current loss of the recording magnetic field" (col. 7, ln. 19-20). The present device includes a magnetic loss material having  $\mu$  loss characteristics designed to improve loss and thereby shield the components on the wiring board.

Accordingly, these claims would not have been obvious from the cited references, and these rejections should now be withdrawn.